DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 355 SP 007 522

AUTHOR	Bessent, Hattie; Cage, B. N.
TITLE	Phase II Assessment; Richmond Virginia Career Opportunities Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Richmond Public Schools, Va.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	85p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; *Disadvantaged Groups; Evaluation Techniques; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Development; Teacher Aides; *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) in Richmond, Virginia, which trained teachers from disadvantaged areas to return to the classrooms in these areas, was assessed. Fifty COP aides and 50 control students were administered opinionnaires, semantic differentials, and How I See Myself Self Concept Scale, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Five children from each of the participants' classrooms were administered the I Feel--Me Feel Self Concept Scale (K-4) or the How I See Myself Self Concept Scale (Elementary or Secondary Form). Analysis of data revealed a) a higher score for COP aides on School and Physical Adequacy after 25 months in the program and a higher score on Competency after 33 months; b) a higher score on Interpersonal Adequacy by non-COP aides after 33 months in the program; c) more positive attitudes toward the teaching process by COP aides on 3 of the 12 semantic scales after 25 months in the program; d) no significant differences between the two groups on this scale after 33 months on the program; and e) a significant change in attitudes of COP aides toward principals, classroom organization, teacher planning sessions, and in-service training sessions. (Changes and recommendations for further research are made. The appendixes present the opinionnaires and semantic scales used to collect data.) (BRB)

ED 085355

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PHASE II ASSESSMENT

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Dr. Hattie Bessent
Dr. B. N. Cage

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

* * * * *

The evaluation and analysis of data reported herein were conducted under Letter of Agreement by and between the Richmond, Virginia Public Schools and Drs. Hattie Bessent and B. N. Cage.

Funds for this evaluation were provided by the Richmond Public School System.

* * * * *

University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

July, 1973

SP007 527

FOREWORD

The teaching of disadvantaged children has been the focus of most education intervention programs in recent years. The federal government has provided funding for these programs with the anticipation that better educational experiences can be found to promote learning. The Career Opportunities Program is one such program and has as its goal the training of teachers from the target area to return to the classrooms from which they came. The returning of these indigenous persons to their own environment stimulates the adult-child relationship which often does not exist in the fullest, reduces teacher-pupil ratios where most needed, and provides employment for persons who may not have had the opportunity otherwise.

This study attempts a continued assessment of the Career Opportunities Program in Richmond, Virginia. The study could not have been accomplished without the assistance of many people. Gratitude is extended to Mrs. Alice Howard, COP Consultant; Mr. Nathaniel Lee, Director of Federal Programs and his staff; Mrs. Mildred Harwell, Acting Coordinator of COP and the staff; Dr. James W. Tyler, Assistant Superintendent; Dr. Elmer Gish, Director of Research and his staff; Dr. Paul Berhens, Guidance Director and his staff; Virginia Union Faculty, Virginia Commonwealth Faculty, Principals,

Teachers, and Paraprofessionals of schools participating in the Career Opportunities Program.

PARTICIPATING AND CONTRIBUTING PERSONNEL

Richmond Public School System

Dr. James Tyler

Dr. Paul Berhens

Dr. Elmer Gish

Mr. Nathaniel Lee

Mr. Edward DeFord

Virginia Union University

Dr. Alex James

Dr. Dorothy Cowling

Mrs. Julia Thornton

Mrs. Erma Brown

Mr. George Binford

Virginia Commonwealth University

Dr. Warren Brandt

Dr. Evelyn Fulbright

Mrs. Gertrude Freeman

Mrs. Lee Reynolds

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	ii
PARTICIPATING AND CONTRIBUTING PERSONNEL	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM	1
Introduction	1
Problem	1
Program and Curricula	3
Structure of Programs at Virginia Union University and Virginia Commonwealth University	5
Recruitment and Selection	6
Criteria	6
In-Service Training	7
Linkages with Other Programs	8
COP Council	9
Youth Tutoring Youth	9
II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	11
Instrumentation	12
Hypotheses	15
Limitations	16
III. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	18
IV. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
APPENDIX	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP Participants at the Conclusion of 25 Program Months	19
II.	Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP Participants at the Conclusion of 33 Program Months	20
III.	Means and F-ratios for 12 Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of 25 Program Months	21
IV.	Means and F-ratios for 12 Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of 33 Program Months	22
V.	Means and Corresponding F-ratios for Attitudes Toward Selected COP Variables Collected at the Conclusion of 25 and 33 Months, Respectively	23
VI.	Distribution of 16 Responses on Selected Criteria From the University Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire	25
VII.	Distribution of Responses from Principals on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP Aides after 25 and 33 Program Months	28
VIII.	Distribution of Responses from Teachers on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP Aides after 25 and 33 Program Months	29

LIST OF TABLES—*Continued*

Table		Page
IX.	Means and Corresponding F-ratios for the I Feel - Me Feel Self Concept Scale for Kindergarten Through Fourth Grade of Experimental and Control Groups for 25 and 33 Program Months	31
X.	Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 5-6 of the Experimental and Control Groups	31
XI.	Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 7-9 of the Experimental and Control Groups	32
XII.	Percentage of COP and non-COP Participants at the End of 33 Program Months for Each Type of Preference Group as Determined by the MBTI	32
XIII.	Number of Aides Per Cell for 16 MBTI Type Table (n = 52)	33
XIV.	Number of non-COP Aides Per Cell for 16 MBTI Type Table (n = 50)	34

CHAPTER I

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Introduction

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) was funded in 1970 for a period of three years under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), Public Law 90-35, Part D to train adults from Model Cities' Neighborhoods for new careers in the field of education. The evaluation team of Drs. Hattie Bessent and B. N. Cage was contracted by the Richmond Public Schools to evaluate the Career Opportunities Program. The evaluation team started the data collection and analyses in the Fall, 1971, and continued with additional data collection and analyses through Spring, 1973. This report contains data relevant to the program evaluation for Fall, 1972, through Spring, 1973.

The first evaluation report of the program, entitled *Richmond, Virginia Career Opportunities Program: An Assessment*, was published in July, 1972. Copies of that report are available from the Career Opportunities Program office in Richmond, Virginia.

Problem

The purpose of this report was the continued evaluation of the Career Opportunities Program in the Richmond

Public School System, Richmond, Virginia from Fall, 1972, to Spring, 1973. The initial evaluation started Fall, 1971, which was the beginning of the second year of operation. At that time, there were approximately 150 participants assigned to 32 different schools. The participants served as auxiliary personnel, the majority of them being teacher aides. The training and educational phase of the program was conducted through the cooperative efforts of Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Universities. Seventy-five participants were assigned to each institution. The overall objectives of the Career Opportunities Program as given in the Federal guidelines were as follows:

1. To help students in the Model Cities' Schools to improve their academic achievement level through the use of COP trainees as teacher aides, teacher helpers, and assistant teachers in the classroom as measured by standardized tests, teacher tests, and teacher judgments.

2. To help students to understand the value of achieving success in school as measured by self-reports and observation techniques of professionals and paraprofessionals.

3. To help paraprofessional trainees demonstrate their ability to academically achieve in college courses as measured by the evaluations of the college instructors.

4. To help schools of education at Virginia Union University and Virginia Commonwealth University demonstrate their ability to cooperatively organize and provide college training programs for para-professionals that will prepare them for new careers in education as measured by the ultimate placement of the trainees in educational positions.

5. To help those schools in the Model Cities' Neighborhood to demonstrate application of the concept of differentiated staffing in the organi-zation of professionals and COP trainees and to

provide enriched educational experiences for their students as observed by administrators, professional and paraprofessional personnel, and citizens of the community.

Program and Curricula

Career Opportunities Program (COP) on Instructional Teams is a federally funded project to train adults from low-income areas to work on instructional teams attuned to the needs of children in deprived areas. Special attention is given to veterans since it is believed that the male image will be beneficial to disadvantaged children living in fatherless homes.

COP is designed to improve the educational achievement of youth in the Model Cities' Neighborhoods through the training of paraprofessionals from the neighborhood for new careers in the field of education. Paraprofessionals and veterans are employed in the Richmond Public School System while participants in college programs that could ultimately prepare them as professional degree teachers. The program is seen as a partnership of school, college, community, and the State Department of Education. Its aim is to enable children from primarily Model Cities' areas to learn more effectively in the classroom. With the help of paraprofessionals to relieve them of some of their duties, teachers have more time to devote to instruction. Teachers are able to give more individual attention and thus, have more time to reach more children. Also when paraprofessionals

are trained, teachers can delegate certain tasks which they themselves would otherwise not have time to do.

The Career Opportunities Program aims to serve both as a vehicle and catalyst for bringing about improvement in school organizations and curriculum. The initial training phase for 50 paraprofessionals, under the sponsorship of the COP program authorized under Public Law 90-35, Part D, Education Professions Development Act of Virginia Union University, began June 8, 1970. The program at Virginia Commonwealth University began June 15, 1970.

At the beginning of the third year of operation, Fall, 1972, there were 143 participants in the program. Of the total number of participants there were 41 males (veterans) and 102 females. These COP-aides were assigned to 35 schools, consisting of 24 elementary, 6 middle, 3 special education, and 2 nongraded schools.

During the summer each COP participant earns 9 to 18 semester credit hours at his respective college. During the regular school year participants can earn an equal number of credit hours per semester. During the year practicum sessions were held for participants. The sessions were a follow-up of problems encountered on the job. Faculty attempted to integrate theories, principles, and concepts with on-the-job experience.

Structure of Programs at Virginia Union University and Virginia Commonwealth University

The training and educational phase of this program is conducted through the cooperative efforts of Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Universities. Seventy-seven participants are assigned to the former institution and 66 to the latter. Participants are entitled to services necessitated by the program.

Practice teaching has been eliminated at cooperating universities due to the COP participant's everyday classroom experience. It was decided these skills were already developed long before the participants entered their junior year of school.

The following objectives were set forth as primary to the overall educational program and continue at present:

1. To provide opportunities for teacher aides to study and learn how they can serve as efficient assistants in the classroom.

2. To introduce new materials, methods and techniques for working with children and to help guide aides in implementing some of these techniques.

3. To provide opportunities for participation in classroom situations of teacher and teacher aide working in all curricular areas using audio-visual aids, art materials, and special teaching techniques.

4. To help aides gain a better insight as well as an understanding of children from prekindergarten through senior high.

5. To provide opportunities for the staff, teachers and teachers aides to discuss and analyze human and public relations in the classroom and school in general.

6. To help aides evaluate their work in an educational setting.

Recruitment and Selection

The Richmond Public Schools have employed paraprofessionals since 1963. Therefore, recruitment of participants was achieved mainly through selection of applicants from those presently employed in various federal programs in the system. The following criteria were used in the selection process:

Criteria

1. Each participant must have a high school diploma or its equivalent.
2. Each participant must be employed by the Richmond Public Schools (except veterans).
3. Aides living and working in the Model Cities' area will get first preference.
4. Aides living in the Model Cities' area but are assigned to other schools in the city will get second preference.
5. Aides living in other areas of the city but working in the Model Cities' schools will get third preference.
6. Aides living in the East End area (a poverty area of Richmond) will get fourth preference.
7. Aides with some college experience assigned to other schools will get fifth preference.

Veterans were recruited through cooperative arrangements with the transition office at Ft. Lee, Virginia. Other methods of recruitment were through advertisement in the newspaper, on television and radio. The first fruits of the COP program were shown this year when four participants graduated from Virginia Commonwealth University and five from Virginia Union University.

The teachers who were chosen to participate in COP were selected on the basis of their expressed desire to be involved in this program and the recommendations of their principals. The recommendations were based on the demonstrated commitment of teachers to improve the achievement level of the children and their ability to cooperatively work with other adults to achieve this goal.

Each school in the Model Cities' area is staffed with a team leader who serves as the liaison between the school and the administrative staff. Her responsibilities are:

1. To supervise the total COP program in the school.
2. To encourage aides to excel in all of their work.
3. To communicate with the advisors of both universities on the progress of the aides.
4. To help plan in-service training for professionals and paraprofessionals.
5. To stress the importance of attending classes and tutoring sessions.
6. To keep principals informed on the progress of the Career Opportunities Program.
7. To stress the importance of developing learning teams to help improve the quality of education.
8. To help evaluate participants as well as the total COP program.

In-Service Training

COP teachers and aides participate in periodic in-service training sessions. The objective of these sessions is to get trainees to understand and utilize the necessary

elements for a successful learning team and to introduce innovative principles and concepts and their implementation.

The third year of in-service training sessions were concentrated in the following areas:

1. Human Relations
2. Social Studies Education
3. Mathematics Education
4. Informal Rap Sessions on Human Relations
5. Teaching Styles
6. Individualized Instruction

Linkages with Other Programs

Paraprofessionals have been employed to assist teachers in many federal programs. Numerous persons working in various federal programs were selected to participate in COP to help decrease academic deprivation in students. The COP program has been linked with programs such as Title I ESEA, Operation Uplift, Head Start, Follow Through, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Local Education Association, Model Cities, Veterans Administration and the EPDA - B2 Project.

The experiences gained by COP participants help improve their contributions to deprived children in these other programs. The Model Neighborhood contains all the federal programs, and each program has representation. The majority of the participants demonstrate the ability to successfully achieve in college courses and exhibit a sincere

desire to enter an educational career devoted primarily to working with deprived children.

COP Council

The COP Council is the Board of Directors of the COP Project. Membership in the council includes representatives from both traditional as well as more recently formed organizations, together with other community residents, parents, and older students who live in the area. The school district and cooperating universities are represented on this Council. Each of these components—school, university, and the community—plays a major role in the project.

The COP Council conducts interviews and screens applicants interested in participating in the program. The major basis for selecting the participants were: (1) commitment to working with deprived children in the Model Cities' area, (2) interest in helping to improve the quality of education, and (3) interest in improving one's own educational background.

Youth Tutoring Youth

The COP has a Youth Tutoring Youth (YTY) in its design. The "Right to Read Youth Tutoring Youth Program" commenced June, 1970, in cooperation with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. There were 25 youths selected to participate with COP—ranging in age from 14 to 16 years old. The idea of having teenagers tutor elementary and secondary school children is a worthwhile innovation. This concept challenges

tutors as well as the tutees. In many instances tutors are inspired to do outside reading and planning for their lessons.

Before the tutors are assigned to the schools, they participate in a three-day workshop to give them an overall idea of the program, their basic duties, and many interesting ways of presenting materials. These workshops are conducted by the tutor's coordinator.

There are many reasons for the success of the program during the summer. For example, the tutors are allowed to choose the school in which they want to work. The closeness of ages in the tutor and tutee establishes a warm working relationship and the tutors are treated as adults in most cases and not as children.

During the 1972-73 academic year, Title I, ESEA provided funds to pay the salaries of 25 tutors from Armstrong and J. F. Kennedy High Schools. Tutorial services were available in three elementary schools. The YTY program operated during the school day utilizing the facilities and resources of the Richmond Public Schools. The teachers in each school work with the coordinator of YTY in helping implement the tutorial program. They identify students at the beginning of the program who could best profit from these tutorial services.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) was initiated based on the underlying assumption of planned variation strategy. To effect change in the system of training teachers and auxiliary aides implies a research and development program which involves process development and change. Evaluation of any one aspect of this type program does not preclude justifiable conclusions, but does demand a systematic approach to evaluation and an attempt to measure as many program characteristics as are quantifiable. Conclusions can be drawn only after all process and product assessments have been made and analyzed. This requires a systematic perusal of the program objectives from which measurable outcomes can be identified and assessed.

The research design chosen to approach this type of evaluation depended heavily on opinions and interview responses from those people involved most in actuating the program. In this study, time series measurements were made at the end of 25 and 33 program months on the experimental and control groups. Assessment of children in classrooms where participants of the experimental and control groups worked was also made at these data collection points.

Of the 143 Career Opportunities Program participants at the beginning of the third program year, 52 subjects (Ss)

were randomly selected to compose the experimental group. A control group of 50 participants were chosen for comparison purposes matched on school (location), grade level taught, and race.

Five children were randomly selected from each of the classrooms in which the experimental and control Ss were assigned. Self-report, self-concept data were collected on each child, with the instrument being administered by the COP Ss. Each COP participant administered the instrument to five children in his classroom and to five other children in a control classroom. The control students were selected based on grade level and location of school for comparative purposes to the experimental students.

Instrumentation

In keeping with the underlying philosophy of process and process-impact evaluation of the COP program, various instruments, opinionnaires, and checklists were used to gather data. A copy of each is found in the Appendix with the exclusion of nationally used tests.

The self-report, self-concept of the experimental and control Ss was measured by use of the *How I See Myself Self Concept Scale.*[1] This instrument contains 40 items using a Likert scale and produces four factors relating to self.

---

[1]Gordon, Ira J. Studying the child in school. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966, p. 73. Scale and directions not to be reproduced without permission of the author.

The factors are: (1) interpersonal adequacy, (2) school and physical adequacy, (3) personal appearance, and (4) competence.

A semantic differential scale using a set of fourteen bipolar adjectives was developed to assess attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process. The bipolar adjectives were chosen to represent a common vocabulary level of the Ss, as well as utilizing the criteria for the development of the semantic differential scale set forth by Osgood and Suci.[2] Twenty-one concepts were rated by the experimental group which included the 12 concepts rated by the control group.

Opinionnaires were developed to solicit responses from college and university administrators and faculty as well as from principals, teachers, and Career Opportunities Program staff members. Item ratings pertaining to effectiveness, cooperation, initiative, ability to do the job, etc., were collected and analyzed. Where a faculty member had had an opportunity to work with Ss from both the experimental and control groups, she was requested to make comparisons between groups on each of the items.

Self-concept data were collected from the children on three instruments. The I Feel - Me Feel Self Concept

---

[2]Osgood, Charles & Suci, George. Factor analysis of meaning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1955, p. 325.

Scale[3] was administered to children in grades K-4. The How I See Myself Self Concept Scale (Elementary Form) was administered to children in grades 5-6 and the secondary form of the same instrument was administered to children in grades 7-9.

The Myers-Brigg Type Indicator was used for the first time in this current evaluation. If people differ systematically in what they perceive and the conclusions they come to they may as a result show corresponding differences in their behaviors, interests, values, needs and motivations towards what they do best and in what they like to do. The Myers-Brigg Type Indicator aims to determine, from self-report of easily reported reactions, people's basic preferences and their combinations may be identified by research and put into practical use. A person's type according to Myers, grows naturally out of the kind of perception and the kind of judgment he prefers and how he prefers to use them. Contained in the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator are separate indices for determining each of the four basic preferences which structure the individual's personality. The four basic preferences are (a) EI Preference: if an individual prefers to use his favorite process for Extraversion or Introversion in choosing to direct perception and judgment upon environment or the world of ideas, (b) SN Preference: if he prefers

---

[3]Yeatts, Perleane. Manual for the I Feel - Me Feel Self Concept Scale. College of Education, University of Georiga: Athens, 1969.

to perceive things through Sensing or Intuition in choosing which of these two kinds of judgments to rely on, (c) TF Preference: if he prefers to make judgments by means of Thinking or Feeling in choosing which of these two kinds of judgments to rely on, (d) JP Preference: if he prefers to face the outer world by choosing a Judging or Perceptive attitude for dealing with the environment. A person's type then becomes that portion of the personality which people create in themselves by their exercise of the four preferences in response to the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator.

The Myers-Brigg Type Indicator consists of 166 forced-choice items that can usually be answered within a period of 50 to 55 minutes. This Indicator relates meaningfully to a wide range of behaviors including personality, ability, interest, value, aptitude and performance measure, academic choice, and behavior measures.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed in order to test the overall objectives set forth by the Career Opportunities Program:

I. There is no significant difference in self-report, self-concept between the Career Opportunities Program (COP) participants and regular teacher aides (non-COP) at the end of 25 program months and 33 program months, respectively.

II. There is no significant difference on the semantic differential ratings of various characteristics of the teaching process between the COP participants and non-COP participants at the

end of 25 program months and 33 program months, respectively.

III. There is no significant gain on the semantic differential ratings of various characteristics pertinent to the Career Opportunities Program by the COP participants between data collection points.

IV. There is no significant difference in level of ratings by program staff on performance and personal characteristics between COP participants and non-COP participants at the end of 33 program months.

V. There is no significant difference between self-report, self-concept of children in classrooms where COP aides work and children in classrooms where non-COP aides work at the end of 25 and 33 program months.

Limitations

Developing and continuing a research design for a comprehensive, process oriented program such as the Career Opportunities Program was a formidable task. The overlap of COP participants into other Title I programs, many children under the tutelage of COP participants also being under Head Start or Follow Through programs, and trying to control for the many impact variables affecting attitudes and performances was close to impossible.

Although a major objective of the COP program is to improve the academic achievement levels of children in classrooms using COP trainees, no data were available from the school test bureau that provided comparison bases on experimental versus control subjects.

A second objective, "to help students to understand the value of achieving success in school" was considered too subjective to quantify and therefore was not considered in the evaluation.

The major thrust of this evaluation was confirmed to: (1) assessing the self-concept and attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process of a sample of experimental and control Ss, (2) assessing the self-concept of a sample of children in classrooms using COP aides and in classrooms using regular teacher aides, and (3) comparing ratings of university and public school staff concerning performance and personal characteristics of the COP and non-COP Ss.

CHAPTER III

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Data were collected on the sample of Career Opportunities Program (COP) participants and the control sample of regular teacher aides at two data collection points, September, 1972, and May, 1973, respectively, These data contained 4 factor scores on a self-report, self-concept scale, 12 comparative scales on characteristics of the teaching process and an additional 9 scales of similar attributes on the experimental group.

Faculty and administrators at the participating universities, Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth, provided ratings on 13 variables concerning personal and teaching attributes of the COP participants. Ratings were also received from principals and teachers pertaining to the performance and personal characteristics of the COP-aides.

Self-report, self-concept data were collected pre and post on 154 children who were students in classrooms where COP-aides were employed, and pre and post on 158 children who were members of classrooms where regular teacher aides were employed.

In testing Hypothesis I, a significant difference was found at the end of 25 months between the experimental (COP) and control group (non-COP) Ss on only factor 2, school

and physical adequacy of the How I See Myself Self Concept Scale (see Table I). As seen in Table II, a significant difference existed between groups at the end of 33 months on the factor of competence. When the gain between data collection points was considered only the control group had a significant gain during this time period. It was for the factor of interpersonal adequacy, improving from a mean of 58.04 to 60.00.

TABLE I

Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP Participants at the Conclusion of 25 Program Months

Factors	COP (n = 52)	non-COP (n = 50)	F-ratio[1]
Interpersonal Adequacy	60.57	58.04	.03
School and Physical Adequacy	43.00	40.82	5.24*
Personal Appearance	24.80	23.24	2.88
Competence	21.22	20.58	1.65

[1]df = 1,100

*$p < .05$

Data concerning Hypothesis II are given in Tables III and IV. As shown in Table III, at the conclusion of 25 months of the program significant differences between means favoring the experimental group were found in the semantic differential ratings of (1) classroom organization, (2) planning sessions

TABLE II

Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP Participants at the Conclusion of 33 Program Months

Factors	COP (n = 52)	non-COP (n = 50)	F-ratio[1]
Interpersonal Adequacy	57.88	60.00	.10
School and Physical Adequacy	42.90	41.68	.29
Personal Appearance	23.98	23.54	.19
Competence	21.14	19.64	6.14*

[1]df = 1,100

*$p < .05$

teachers, and (3) in-service training sessions. At the end of 33 program months, no significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups on the 12 semantic differential ratings.

The COP participants ratings on (1) school principal, (2) classroom organization, (3) planning sessions with teachers, and (4) in-service training sessions went down significantly between data collection points. Their ratings on future school plans and supervisors went up during the same time period. The non-COP participants showed no significant increase or decrease on any of the semantic differential ratings.

The data pertinent to Hypothesis III are presented in Table V. Attitudes of the COP-aides as measured by a

TABLE III

Means and F-ratios for 12 Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of 25 Program Months

Characteristics	COP (n = 52)	non-COP (n = 50)	F-ratios[1]
My teacher	85.53	83.98	1.29
Classroom experiences	84.38	84.08	.02
School principal	82.59	80.30	3.80
Classroom organization	86.68	81.94	6.51*
Future school plans	80.17	81.39	.09
Planning sessions with teacher	85.28	81.67	4.01*
In-service training sessions	86.79	79.98	8.79**
Relationship to students in classroom	83.36	86.04	1.82
My supervisor	81.67	82.66	.68
Relationship to staff members (other than teacher)	83.95	84.90	1.13
Relationship to aides (other than COP aide)	83.00	85.30	2.71
Relationship to COP aide	86.23	83.66	3.03

[1] df = 1,100

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

TABLE IV

Means and F-ratios for 12 Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of 33 Program Months

Characteristics	COP (n = 52)	non-COP (n = 50)	F-ratios[1]
My teacher	83.04	83.08	.01
Classroom experiences	83.74	84.50	.22
School Principal	76.00	79.23	3.66
Classroom organization	80.06	80.73	.13
Future school plans	83.23	80.41	1.50
Planning sessions with teacher	81.94	83.02	.22
In-service training sessions	80.64	80.30	.07
Relationship to students in classroom	84.68	85.31	.15
My supervisor	84.28	83.28	.68
Relationship to staff members (other than teacher)	85.83	83.98	.96
Relationship to aides (other than COP aides)	84.80	84.13	.15
Relationship to COP aide	85.38	83.93	1.60

[1]df = 1,100

TABLE V

Means and Corresponding F-ratios for Attitudes Toward Selected COP Variables Collected at the Conclusion of 25 and 33 Months, Respectively

Attitudes Toward	25 Months	33 Months	F-ratios[1]
Career Opportunities Program	86.61	86.11	.13
College courses	78.68	78.91	.01
College professors	81.32	79.40	.91
Team leaders	82.64	81.92	.11
COP director	83.38	82.40	.17
COP staff members (other than director)	85.54	83.26	2.54
College advisors	82.47	81.60	.20
Help given by tutors	74.61	83.00	4.05*
Relationship with tutors	77.90	83.36	3.07

[1] df = 1,102

*$p < .05$

semantic differential scale, increased significantly toward help given by tutors. Relationship with tutors approached significance with a mean gain of 5.46 points.

Various opinionnaires were used to solicit data concerning the performance and personal characteristics of COP participants, and where applicable, comparisons between COP-aides and non-COP aides were requested from staff members who were in a position to make such comparisons.

The University Faculty and Administrative Oppinionnaire was completed by 16 faculty members and administrators at Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth. The data in Table VI show the distribution of responses on these items.

Seventeen public school principals having had both COP-aides and non-COP aides in their schools responded to the Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire after 25 program months. Thirteen principals responded after 33 months. Table VII presents this distribution of responses on the comparison of COP-aides to regular teacher aides on the ten attributes.

Similar comparisons were made by teachers in the public schools who had had both regular teacher aides and COP-aides under their supervision. A sample of 29 teachers completed the Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire after 25 months and 25 teachers provided information after 33 months. Their responses comparining COP-aides against regular teacher aides on the same 10 attributes as did principals appear in Table VIII.

Two additional questions were asked of principals and teachers soliciting a positive or negative reply. They were (1) "Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers?" and (2) "Should a Career Opportunities Program be given to people at all socio-economic levels?" In response to question 1, 98% of the principals and teachers answered in the affirmative, and on question 2, 92% in the affirmative.

TABLE VI

Distribution of 16 Responses on Selected Criteria From the University Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire

Criteria	Responses							
	Pre-25 Months				Post-33 Months			
	Better	Same	Worse	N.R.	Better	Same	Worse	N.R.
How does the academic progress of a Career Opportunities Program participant compare to any other college student in your university? Or class?	3	10	3	0	7	5	1	3
How does class attendance of Career Opportunities students compare to other students?	5	6	3	2	5	9	0	2
	Yes	No	N.A.	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.	N.R.
Do you feel a Career Opportunities Program student needs more of your time and counseling than does any other student?	6	9	0	1	2	9	2	3
Do you refer Career Opportunities Program participants for counseling more frequently than any other student?	6	7	2	1	2	9	2	3
Do Career Opportunities Program students seem to adjust to college life as readily as other students?	11	3	1	1	10	2	2	2

TABLE VI—*Continued*

Criteria	Responses							
	Pre-25 Months				Post-33 Months			
	Yes	No	N.A.	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.	N.R.
Do Career Opportunities Program Students take advantage of your posted office hours?	11	2	2	1	10	0	4	2
Do Career Opportunities Program students seem satisfied with their progress in your class?	9	2	3	2	10	0	4	2
Do the Career Opportunities Program Students participate in class discussion as well as other students?	13	1	1	1	11	0	2	3
Does the Career Opportunities Program fit into the overall philosophy of your university?	14	1	0	1	13	0	2	1
Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers?	14	1	0	1	14	0	2	0
Should a Career Opportunities Program be given to people from all socio-economic classes rather than to just people from the lower socio-economic class?	11	3	1	1	13	0	1	2

TABLE VI—*Continued*

Criteria	Responses							
	Pre-25 Months				Post-33 Months			
	Have Own	Need Teacher	N.A.	N.R.	Have Own	Need Teacher	N.A.	N.R.
Do Career Opportunities Program students have self-motivation or does it seem to take more motivation on your part to get them going?	10	4	1	1	11	2	1	2
	N.A.	None	Other	N.R.	N.A.	None	Other	N.R.
What problems and issues have arisen administratively due to the admittance of Career Opportunities Programs?	0	6	8	2	4	8	4	0

TABLE VII

Distribution of Responses from Principals on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP Aides after 25 and 33 Program Months

Attribute	Pre-25 Months				Post-33 Months			
	Greater	Same	Poorer	NR	Greater	Same	Poorer	NR
Effectiveness	15	2	0	0	11	1	0	1
Interest in job	15	2	0	0	6	7	0	0
Cooperation	9	8	0	0	3	10	0	0
Ability to do job	13	4	0	0	10	2	0	1
Initiative	14	3	0	0	8	5	0	0
Social maturity	10	7	0	0	8	5	0	0
Promptness	7	10	0	0	3	9	1	0
Intelligence	11	6	0	0	7	5	0	1
Working with children	14	3	0	0	9	3	0	1
Ability to get along with others	7	10	0	0	5	8	0	0

TABLE VIII

Distribution of Responses from Teachers on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP Aides after 25 and 33 Program Months

Attribute	Pre-25 Months				Post-33 Months			
	Greater	Same	Poorer	NR	Greater	Same	Poorer	NR
Effectiveness	19	4	2	4	15	6	1	3
Interest in job	17	8	2	2	16	3	1	5
Cooperation	10	15	2	2	9	10	1	5
Ability to do job	21	5	1	2	16	4	1	4
Initiative	17	6	4	2	14	5	1	5
Social maturity	12	11	4	2	6	10	3	6
Promptness	5	16	6	2	6	13	1	5
Intelligence	16	9	0	4	10	7	1	7
Working with children	18	6	3	2	14	3	1	7
Ability to get along with others	7	18	1	3	6	13	1	5

In an open response question, teachers and principals were asked to list changes they had seen occur in the COP-aides and to indicate whether these changes were positive or negative. Several items occurred repeatedly and always with a positive reflection. Some of the changes listed were:

1. More enthusiasm toward teaching
2. More self confidence
3. More initiative
4. More effectiveness
5. Better relationship with students
6. More mature and responsible
7. More serious about goals

Three different instruments were used to assess the self concept of children in classrooms where COP-aides and regular teacher aides were employed. The data collected were analyzed at three levels, those being (including Special Education) grades K-4, 5-6, and 7-9. The data in Table IX show the self concept means of experimental versus control for students in grades kindergarten through fourth. No significant differences were found after either 25 or 33 program months. The means for grades 5-6 are given in Table X. A significant mean difference favoring the control group was found in factor I of the How I See Myself Self Concept Scale.

The data in Table XI show the means and F-ratios for the HISM for grades 7-9. A significant mean difference favoring the experimental group was found in factor 3.

Data with respect to MBTI testing are contained in Table XII. As indicated in the table, the prevalent

TABLE IX

Means and Corresponding F-ratios for the I Feel - Me Feel Self Concept Scale for Kindergarten Through Fourth Grade of Experimental and Control Groups for 25 and 33 Program Months

	25 Months	33 Months
Experimental (n = 115)	162.58	164.35
Control (n = 117)	165.14	164.37
	F = 1.48 df = 1,230	F = .00 df = 1,230

TABLE X

Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 5-6 of the Experimental and Control Groups

	Experimental (n = 16)		Control (n = 15)		F-ratios[1]	
Factors	25 months	33 months	25 months	33 months	25 months	33 months
1	48.20	48.80	46.20	60.33	.82	8.65**
2	37.64	38.17	34.53	32.00	3.56	3.07
3	21.38	22.63	20.43	21.67	.57	.05
4	23.49	23.87	23.37	20.33	.01	1.10

[1]df = 1,29

**$p < .01$

preferences for the respective MBTI scales for the COP participants were extraversion, sensing, thinking, and judging.

TABLE XI

Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 7-9 of the Experimental and Control Groups

Factors	Experimental (n = 30)		Control (n = 15)		F-ratios[1]	
	25 months	33 months	25 months	33 months	25 months	33 months
1	47.60	49.15	46.15	47.87	.62	.41
2	37.94	39.25	39.76	38.87	1.61	.07
3	25.49	23.83	22.32	21.91	6.04**	1.84
4	27.46	25.90	25.38	25.00	2.92	.43

[1]df = 1,59

**$p < .05$

TABLE XII

Percentage of COP and non-COP Participants at the End of 33 Program Months for Each Type of Preference Group as Determined by the MBTI

	COP (n = 52)	non-COP (n = 50)
Extraversion (E)	65.4%	00.0%
Introversion (I)	34.6%	60.0%
Sensing (S)	78.8%	100.0%
Intuition (I)	21.2%	0.0%
Thinking (T)	57.7%	50.0%
Feeling (F)	42.3%	50.0%
Judging (J)	69.2%	92.0%
Perception (P)	30.8%	8.0%

The preferences for the non-COP participants were introversion, sensing, and judging. As to the thinking-feeling type preference group, the non-COP aides were equally distributed. It would appear that the ESTJ and the IS-J preference types, based on the percentages in Table XII, were the dominant types for aides in this study.

An examination of the MBTI preference type cells in Tables XIII and XIV show that 11 COP aides (21%) were actually ESTJs. Nineteen percent (10) were ESFJs. The dominant cell for the non-COP aides was ISFJ (32%). Twenty-four percent were ISTJs.

TABLE XIII

Number of Aides Per Cell for 16 MBTI Type Table (n = 52)

ISTJ 7	ISFJ 3	INFJ 0	INTJ 0
ISTP 2	ISFP 2	INFP 4	INTP 0
ESTP 4	ESFP 2	ENFP 1	ENTP 1
ESTJ 11	ESFJ 10	ENFJ 0	ENTJ 5

It would seem that the COP participants could be viewed as being more extraverted and thinking-oriented than non-COP aides. This would seem to enhance the COP participants in their chosen field of working with children.

TABLE XIV

Number of non-COP Aides Per Cell for 16 MBTI Type Table (n = 50)

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
12	16	0	0
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
1	1	0	0
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
1	1	0	0
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ
11	7	0	0

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Career Opportunities Program in Richmond, Virginia, during its third year of operation from the Fall, 1972, until Spring, 1973. Five broad program objectives were stated producing five general hypotheses which were tested in order to ascertain the extent to which these objectives were fulfilled.

The analysis of the data pertaining to the self concept of Career Opportunities Program and non-COP aides indicated significant differences favoring the COP-aides on the factor of School and Physical Adequacy after 25 months and on the factor of Competence after 33 months. Only on the factor of Interpersonal Adequacy after 33 program months did the non-COP aides score higher than the COP aides.

Attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process significantly favored the COP aides on three of the twelve semantic scales after 25 program months. Significant mean differences were found on the scales of (1) classroom organization, (2) planning sessions with teacher, and (3) in-service training sessions. The latter difference was highly significant at the .01 probability level. After 33 program months no significant differences were found on any scale.

It is interesting to note that the mean semantic scale scores for the COP-aide reduced significantly between 25 program months and 33 program months on the scale of (1) school principal, (2) classroom organization, (3) planning sessions with teacher, and (4) in-service training sessions. At the same time, the non-COP aides remained quite stable on all the semantic scales.

One rationale for this significant reduction in attitude toward principals, classroom organization, teacher planning sessions, and in-service training sessions may be reflected in the advanced college work taken by the participants. This same trend was noted during the program year, Fall, 1971, to Spring, 1972.[1] The additional theory and methodology courses pursued in upper division work may well cause a change in attitude toward people and working conditions. The researchers do not find this disadvantageous, but merely an indication of the difference in attitude that can occur over an eight month period of time.

The evaluators are well aware that the COP participants self-concept and attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process are but two of the many variables contributing to the overall assessment of the COP program. As discussed in Chapter II, Research Design and Methodology, the complexity and uniqueness of the program make it difficult to pinpoint major underlying causes.

---

[1]See Richmond Virginia Career Opportunities Program: An Assessment. July, 1972.

When consideration is given to the attitudes of those people who see the program in operation and have the opportunity to "live" with the participants in their day to day experiences, further substantiation is given for the COP program. This is seen by various data. One, enriching experiences are provided for the participants, for example, field trips to observe other COP sites. These trips included visits to the Bank Street College and Dr. Lillian Weber's Open Corridor Schools, both in New York. Two, during the third year of operation the grade point average (GPA) distribution for COP-aides was the following: above average - 15%, average - 75%, below average - 10%. (The average GPA is that of the undergraduate student body of the college or university attended by each COP aide.) Third, the attrition rate of COP participants the first year (1970-71) was 18% and the second year (1971-72) was 14%. The attrition rate for the third year was only 10%. The reasons for attrition were varied, some being personal family obligations, pregnancy, poor health, and personal illness.

Not only do these data evidence success within the COP-aide group, but other data indicate substantial progress being made within the cooperating university systems and Model Cities' Neighborhood. The following changes have occurred due to the Career Opportunities Program:

1. Student teaching experience has been waived at both participating universities for COP participants.
2. Professors from both universities and staff from local agencies serve on Career Opportunities Program Council.

3. Credit hours toward the degree are given each COP participant for work experience received on the job.

4. Career Opportunities Program participants serve on the Educational Study Committee in the Model Cities' Neighborhood.

Every segment of the community questionnaire completed by college faculty, school principals, and teachers overwhelmingly rated the Career Opportunities Program participants higher than regular teacher aides in all categories assessing job performance and personal characteristics. This documentation by non-biased observers substantially supports the efforts and outcome of the Career Opportunities Program.

In terms of the foregoing assessment the following recommendations are made and questions pursued:

1. The COP director and staff should make a concentrated effort to investigate more thoroughly the relationship between the COP participants and the public school teachers and principals with whom they work. How many COP-aides are still with the same teacher? Or, how many COP-aides have been working with various teachers or in different schools? Are there any differences in attitudes or feelings between the two groups of participants?

2. The COP-aides had very favorable attitudes toward tutors and the help they had been given. Are there more COP participants that need this help? Are there other kinds of personal help needed by the COP-aides?

3. A follow-up study needs to be made with the graduates from the program. Are they successful in their chosen career? What suggestions do they have for program improvement as they reflect on their participation?

APPENDIX

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM
FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPINIONNAIRE

1. Name _____ 2. Title _____

3. School _____

4. How long have you been working or associated with Career Opportunities Program Aides?

_____

5. Have you worked with a regular teacher aide as well as a Career Opportunity Program Aide?

Yes _____ No _____

6. How do you compare the Career Opportunities Program aide to the regular teacher aide in terms of:

		Circle One		
(a)	Effectiveness	greater	same	poorer
(b)	Interest in job	greater	same	poorer
(c)	Cooperation	greater	same	poorer
(d)	Ability to do job	greater	same	poorer
(e)	Initiative	greater	same	poorer
(f)	Social maturity	greater	same	poorer
(g)	Promptness	greater	same	poorer
(h)	Intelligence	greater	same	poorer
(i)	Working with children	greater	same	poorer
(j)	Ability to get along with others	greater	same	poorer

7. Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers?

Yes _____ No _____

8. Should a Career Opportunities Program be open to people at all socio-economic levels rather than just those at the lower socio-economic level?

Yes _____ No _____

9. (For tutors only) Do the Career Opportunities Program aides request your services on a regular basis?

Yes _____ No _____

10. (For Tutors only) Do you feel the tutoring program for Career Opportunities Program aides has been worth your time and effort?

Yes _____ No _____

11. (For principals and team leaders only) What problems and issues have arisen administratively due to the Career Opportunities Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. What changes have you seen occur in Career Opportunities Program aides since they have been in the program? Are the changes positive or negative?

_____

_____

_____

13. What relationship do you have with Virginia Commonwealth University or Virginia Union University in terms of the Career Opportunities Program? Meetings, etc?

_____

_____

_____

_____

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPINIONNAIRE

1. Name _____ 2. Title _____

3. University _____

4. How long have you been working with Career Opportunities Program Aides? _____

5. How does the academic progress of a Career Opportunities Program participant compare to any other college student in your university? or class?

   Circle one - Better Same Worse

6. Do you feel a Career Opportunities Program student needs more of your time and counselling than does any other student?

   Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

7. Do you refer Career Opportunities Program participants for counselling more frequently than any other student?

   Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

8. Do Career Opportunities Program students seem to adjust to college life as readily as other students? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

9. Do Career Opportunities Program students take advantage of your posted office hours? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

10. Do Career Opportunities Program students seem satisfied with their progress in your class? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

11. Do Career Opportunities Program students have self-motivation or does it seem to take more motivation on your part to get them going?

    Have own motivation _____

    Need teacher's motiviation _____

    NA _____

12. Do the Career Opportunities Program students participate in class discussions as well as other students?

    Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

13. How does class attendance of Career Opportunities Program students compare to other students?

Circle one - Better Same Worse

14. Does the Career Opportunities Program fit into the overall philosophy of your university? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

15. Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

16. Should a Career Opportunities Program be given to people from all socio-economic classes rather than to just people from the lower socio-economic class? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

17. What problems and issues have arisen administratively due to the admittance of Career Opportunities Program? NA, None, or

_____

_____

_____

_____

18. As a tutor, do the Career Opportunities Program aides request your services on a regular basis? Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

19. As a tutor, do you feel the tutoring program for Career Opportunities Program aides has been worth your time and effort?

Yes ____ No ____ NA ____

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
FOR NON-CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM TEACHER AIDES

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

I feel that my teacher is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my experiences in the classroom have been:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the school principal is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the organization in my classroom is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my future school plans are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the planning sessions with any teacher are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the in-service training sessions are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the relationship with the students in my classroom is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my supervisor is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to staff members (other than my teacher is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to aides (other than Career Opportunities Program aides) is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to Career Opportunities Program aides is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
FOR CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM AIDES

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

I feel that the Career Opportunities Program is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my teacher is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my college courses are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my college professors are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my experiences in the classroom have been:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the school principal is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the team leader is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the organization in my classroom is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my future school plans are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : __	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the planning sessions with any teacher are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the in-service training sessions are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the Career Opportunities Program Director is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the Career Opportunities Program staff members (other than Director) are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the relationship with the students in my classroom is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my college advisors are:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my supervisor is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to staff members (other than my teacher is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to aides (other than Career Opportunities Program aides) is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to Career Opportunities Program aides is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that the help given to me by my tutor is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast

I feel that my relationship with my tutor is:

Strong	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Weak
Good	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Bad
Dirty	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Clean
Exciting	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Boring
Permanent	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Changing
Valuable	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Soft
Fair	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Unfair
Kind	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Successful
Wise	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Foolish
Slow	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	Fast